



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/588,879	06/06/2000	Nobuyoshi Morimoto	5596-00200	1074

7590

08/27/2003

Dan R Christen  
Conley Rose & Tayon PC  
PO Box 3267  
Houston, TX 77253-3267

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/588,879

Applicant(s)

MORIMOTO, NOBUYOSHI

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2,3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 37 are presented for examination.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14 – 16, 18 – 22, 24 – 26, 28 – 31, 33, 34, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shelton et al. (6418471) (hereinafter Shelton) in view of Maria et al. (6092110) (hereinafter Maria).

3. Referencing claim 1, Shelton teaches a method for identifying distinct users accessing a web site, the method comprising:

4. storing one or more records in a database, wherein each record comprises an Internet address and a time value, and wherein each record corresponds to a different computer accessing said web site, (e.g. col. 10, lines 16 – 42);

5. receiving a first request from a first computer to access the web site, (e.g. col. 6, lines 7 – 23);

6. sending a request for information to said first computer, wherein said information comprises a first Internet address and a first time value corresponding to said first computer, (e.g. col. 6, lines 7 – 23);

7. receiving said information, (e.g. col. 6, lines 7 – 23), but does not specifically teach determining whether a matching record for said first Internet address and said first time value exists in said database; and

Art Unit: 2143

8. identifying said first computer as a distinct user if said matching record does not exist in said database.

Maria teaches determining whether a matching record for said first Internet address and said first time value exists in said database, (e.g. col. 8, lines 1 – 22); and

9. identifying said first computer as a distinct user if said matching record does not exist in said database, (e.g. col. 8, lines 1 – 22). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Maria with Shelton because it would be more efficient for a system to update and log users interactions with a web sites which could aid in the determination in trends that the users interests will gravitate towards, which the host will be able to change and alter their web site to accommodate the use.

10. As per claim 2, Shelton teaches said time value is associated with a user-defined event, (e.g. col. 10, lines 16 – 42 & col. 10, line 61 – col. 11, line 7).

11. As per claim 3, Shelton teaches said user-defined event is a launch of a web browser software on said first computer system, (e.g. col. 10, lines 16 – 42 & col. 10, line 61 – col. 11, line 7).

12. As per claim 5, Shelton teaches said Internet address is an Internet Protocol (IP) address, (e.g. col. 10, lines 16 – 42 & col. 10, line 61 – col. 11, line 7).

13. As per claim 6, Shelton teaches the database is an object oriented database or a relational database, (e.g. col. 10, lines 16 – 42 & col. 10, line 61 – col. 11, line 7).

14. As per claim 8, Shelton teaches said first computer is a personal computer, a laptop computer, a notebook computer, an Internet-enabled cellular phone, an Internet-enabled personal digital assistant, or an Internet-enabled television, (e.g. col. 1, lines 15 – 45).

15. Claims 9, 11, 12, 14 – 16, 18 – 22, 24 – 26, 28 – 31, 33, 34, 36 and 37 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

16. Claims 4, 7, 10, 13, 17, 23, 27, 32 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shelton et al. (6418471) (hereinafter Shelton) in view of Maria (6092110) in further view of Bodnar et al. (6295541) (hereinafter Bodnar).

17. As per claim 4, Shelton and Maria do not specifically teach said time value is generated by a time keeping device, wherein said time keeping device is configured to synchronize said time value with a global time keeping standard clock. Bodnar teaches said time value is generated by a time keeping device, wherein said time keeping device is configured to synchronize said time value with a global time keeping standard clock, (e.g. col. 9, lines 19 – 60 & col. 25, line 52 – col. 26, line 20). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bodnar with the combine system of Shelton and Maria because it would be more efficient for a system to have a standard clock set to monitor users in trends in users accessing the web site and when the most users access the web site at a time, (peak time), and adjust the web site to accommodate the users as such.

18. As per claim 7, Shelton and Maria teach all that is described above but does not specifically teach said timestamp for said matching record is older than a predetermined maximum time. Bodnar said timestamp for said matching record is older than a predetermined maximum time, (e.g. col. 27, line 40 – col. 28, line 31). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bodnar with the combine system of Shelton and Maria because it would be more efficient for a system to update the database

Art Unit: 2143

after a predetermined max time so to have a dynamic database that would never have information that is older than the predetermined max time which would aid in the determination of user trends in close to real-time data.

19. Claims 10, 13, 17, 23, 27, 32 and 35 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

### *Conclusion*

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

21. a. Mattaway et al. U.S. Patent No. 6185184 discloses Directory server for providing dynamically assigned network protocol addresses.

22. b. Hutton et al. U.S. Patent No. 6108704 discloses Point-to-point internet protocol.

23. c. Ingrassia, Jr. et al. U.S. Patent No. 6035332 discloses Method for monitoring user interactions with web pages from web server using data and command lists for maintaining information visited and issued by participants.

24. d. Weinberg et al. U.S. Patent No. 6549944 discloses Use of server access logs to generate scripts and scenarios for exercising and evaluating performance of web sites.

25. e. Guenthner et al. U.S. Patent No. 6134588 discloses High availability web browser access to servers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 703-305-5333. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

Art Unit: 2143

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are none for regular communications and none for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is none.

David E. England  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143

De  
August 14, 2003

  
DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100